



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,896	07/07/2003	Yvon Charbonneau	15782-2US CMB/AA/mb	4329
20988	7590	09/07/2005	EXAMINER	
OGILVY RENAULT LLP 1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE SUITE 1600 MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3 CANADA			HESS, DANIEL A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/612,896	CHARBONNEAU, YVON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel A. Hess	2876	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Daniel A. Hess. (3) Marc Benoit.
 (2) Yvon Charbonneau. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 August 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-5-7, 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

DANIEL STCYR
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Some points made by the examiner include:

- (1) Some clarification should be made in the claims that there are two types of bars. Otherwise the idea of wide and narrow bars is indefinite. It should be conveyed that one type of bars is wider with respect to the other type, which is narrower.
- (2) The examiner is more inclined to consider allowing method claims than claims such as claim 6 which refers to 'a sequence of bar codes' as an apparatus. The reason is related to the doctrine of intended use: for example, Flint et al. may have a bar code sequence in his scrolling application that happens to begin with a wide bar. In such a case, the limitations of an apparatus claim could be met.
- (3) There is a real possibility of allowance of the method claims such as those suggested by the applicant informally, provided the clarification is made as to (1). However, additional searching is required.

DM
8/31/05